



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Remarks on the Group *Carolinæ* of the Genus *Rosa*, II.

By G. N. BEST.

In the December number, 1887, of the BULLETIN, I suggested the advisability of dropping *Rosa lucida*, Ehrh., as a species and placing it under *Rosa humilis*, Marsh., as a variety. The reason assigned for so doing was that these roses ran into each other to such an extent that it was often impossible to separate them. In the Eastern States the former seems to be the prevailing form; in the Southern and Western the latter; in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania a sad mixture (to the botanist) of both is encountered.

Last winter Dr. Porter and myself forwarded to M. Crépin quite a number of specimens collected in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. These we regarded as *Rosa humilis*, and its varieties as described in the article already referred to. In our determinations the learned rhodologist concurred, observing, however, that none of our specimens, although some approached it, was what he was pleased to call the "true" *Rosa lucida*.* The points are these: this rose is a rare or rarely observed form, quite different from what is commonly recognized as such by American botanists; his knowledge of it depends largely, but not wholly, on European cultures, from which it was described by Ehrhart; he possesses two indigenous specimens, one from Boston, Mass., the other from Warrick, R. I.; all the ordinary forms hitherto ranked under *R. lucida* and *R. humilis* are but variations of the latter.

To differentiate it from *Rosa humilis*, M. Crépin insists on its sepals being entire, rarely the outer slightly lobed; leaves nine-foliolate, rarely seven-foliolate on flowering branches, the stipules long and broad with toothed margins, the bush durable and roots not surculose.

The stipules, as I think, are so prone to reflect the changes incident to growth as to be of comparatively little value as a specific indication. The sepals, the importance of which is in many respects so great in diagnosis, just so far as being entire or slightly lobed goes, possess little significance. M. Crépin in discussing the

*Nouvelles Remarques sur les Roses Americaines (suite)—9 fev., 1889.

characters which separate *R. Arkansana*, Porter, from *R. blanda*, Ait., says of the sepals: "If the presence of appendices are more frequent in *R. Arkansana* than in *R. blanda*, this character it appears to me has not the importance that Dr. Watson ascribes to it, and I even think that it has no specific value at all."* The autumnal coloration is often observed in *R. Carolina* and (as I am informed) in *R. nitida*; it is occasionally seen in *R. humilis*.

So far as the mode of vegetation goes, there are two types met with in what M. Crépin recognizes as *R. humilis*; in one the bush perishes after two or three years, its life depending in a measure on the severity of the winters, to be replaced by a new growth given off from its roots; the other under favorable conditions lives for years, the bark frequently becoming gray, new stems arising from the base of the old, forming clumps like the stems in *R. Carolina*. M. Crépin seems not aware that the latter type is the usual one in what I have called var. *lucida*.

Abundant opportunities to investigate the in-ground growth of these roses have shown me that all the forms are more or less surculose. If the stems of *R. Carolina* be raised to the ground, the following season will witness a crop, usually copious, of young shoots from every part of their predecessor's roots; the terminal portion is often transformed into an ascending axis. Here is a question of degree, not of quality. The bushes of *R. humilis* are not so hardy, so durable, more likely to be winter-killed; and, if so, stems will spring up from any part of the roots, often bearing flowers the same season, a thing seldom, if ever, observed in *R. Carolina*.

In the herbarium of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, I saw a specimen from Kew Gardens which corresponded very closely with the description given of the "true" *R. lucida*. The sepals entire, branches erect-ascending, stipules broad and margins toothed, leaves mostly nine-foliolate, some however seven foliolate; when the former, a forcing was noticeable, in that the lower pair was smaller and sometimes one leaflet of this pair rudimentary. Specimens collected by Mr. J. H. Redfield at Mt. Desert, Maine, when compared with the Kew specimen, made

*Nouvelles Remarques sur les Roses Americaines—la seance du 12 Mars, 1887.

it evident, as I think, that the latter was such as the former would produce if cultivated. If guessing be allowable, I would say that the originals of the European cultures emanated from near the Atlantic coast, in rich soil, alluvial deposit, just such as is most favorable to a very vigorous growth; that to all intents and purposes they differ not from what is recognized by us as *R. lucida* (*R. humilis*, var. *lucida*).

Another problem, perhaps still more difficult, is to know what are the actual relationships, between eastern forms of the *humilis* group and those of the south and west. Are they in reality but one polymorphous species, the transitional forms due to difference in location and climate—in a word—to environment? Or are they distinct species, the intermediate forms hybrids? To the solution of this problem I bespeak the indulgent aid of all botanists, especially the Eastern, reminding them of the possibility of crossing between species and the production of fertile hybrids; and that environment modifies all forms but in all probability the most markedly those of hybridic origin.

Botanical Notes.

Corrections. There are two mistakes in the May BULLETIN. Professor Bailey's report of the blooming of *Houstonia cœrulea* on February 26th, is just a month earlier than what he intended to report, March 26th. In the enumeration of Richmond County plants *Aster cordifolius*, var. *glabratus*, should read var. *lævigatus*, under which name it was published by Professor Porter in the March issue; the other name had been used in manuscript and was inadvertently retained when Mr. Hollick made up the copy.

Pinus rigida, Mill. At South Amboy, New Jersey, a short time ago, I noticed some young shoots about sixteen inches high growing from the stump of a pine about six inches in diameter. While examining the shoots, I was interested to note that the primary leaves were about one and a quarter inches in length, and from their axils grew fascicles in some cases of four leaves, though the majority of the secondary leaves were in threes.

At Cliffwood, New Jersey, I have since found a small pine

*See Journal of the Trenton Nat. Hist. Soc. No. IV., *N. A. Roses*, etc.